



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/334,054 | 06/15/1999 | DAVID W. JOHNSON | 11381 | 4885 |
| 22827 | 7590 | 09/14/2004 | EXAMINER | |
| DORITY & MANNING, P.A. POST OFFICE BOX 1449 GREENVILLE, SC 29602-1449 | | | NOLAN, SANDRA M | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |

1772

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/334,054 | Applicant(s) JOHNSON, DAVID W. | |
| | Examiner Sandra M. Nolan | Art Unit 1772 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19, 21, 22 and 31-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11, 14-19, 22, 31-35 and 37 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 13, 21 and 36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims

1. Claims 1-19, 21-22 and 31-37 are pending.
2. Claims 20 and 23-30 have been cancelled.

Rejections Withdrawn

3. The 35 USC 103 rejection of claims 1-8, 11-22, 31-33 and 35-37 as unpatentable over JP 89023565B (abstract) in view of Van Thillo et al (US 5,008,178), as expressed in section 4 of the 02 March 2004 office action, is withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments in the response dated 24 May 2004.
4. The 35 USC 103 rejection of claim 10 as unpatentable over JP 89023565B, Van Thillo and Nash (US 5,620,773) is withdrawn in view of applicant's arguments in the 24 May 2004 response.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-11, 14-19, 22, 31-35 and 37 are allowed.
6. The prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the use of partially-embedded colloidal silica powder on the outer surfaces of rubber gloves as friction modifiers for that surface.

New Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1772

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. Claims 12, 13, 21 and 36 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Misch et al (US 3,637,416) in view of JP 0216427A (abstract).

Misch teaches the treatment of the surfaces of synthetic elastomeric articles with silicone coatings and silica particles (col. 4, lines 68-75) in order to render the surfaces conductive (col. 4, lines 9-11).

JP 02164527A teaches a slip-proof coating containing colloidal silica particles.

See the title and the first sentence of the abstract.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to employ the colloidal silica of the Japanese abstract in a coating for the elastomeric articles of Misch in order to produce articles whose surfaces are both conductive and slip-proof.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be addressed to Sandra M. Nolan, at telephone number 571/272-1495. She can normally be reached Monday through Thursday, from 6:30 am to 4:00 pm, Eastern Time.

Application/Control Number: 09/334,054

Page 4

Art Unit: 1772

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, her supervisor, Harold Pyon, can be reached at 571/272-1498.

The fax number for patent application documents is 703/872-9306.



S. M. Nolan
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 1700

09334054(20040906)